Views of English Language Teachers on the Use of Education Technology in English Classes in Turkish Elementary Schools(Case of Elazýð City, Turkey)

Mehmet Nuri Gömleksýz

Fìrat Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eüitim Bilimleri Bölümü 23119, Elazig, Turkey

Abstract: The use of education technology is an important dimension in foreign language classes to realize effective language teaching. Using education technology in classes helps teachers realize a better and more effective teaching-learning environment. In this study 150 English teachers working in Turkish Elementary schools were surveyed in order to determine their views and attitudes on the use of education technology in their classes. A five-point Likert type attitude scale was developed and used in the study. It consists of 36 items measuring positive and negative attitudes of English teachers towards use of technology. The teachers were also asked which technological aids and techniques they use in their classes. It was determined that teachers have positive attitudes towards use of education technology but they cannot obtain or use technology easily. They sometimes have problems in obtaining necessary equipment for effective English Language Teaching.

Key words: Education technology, english teachers, attitudes towards technology, teaching-learning environment

INTRODUCTION

In recent years much attention has been focused on the use of technology in classes and so many researches have been surveyed[1-7]. All such studies contribute to the idea of the importance of use of education technology in English classes. As Baylor and Ritchie[8] pointed out Identifying the value of technology in schools has challenged educational researchers for more than 20 years. Part of the problem is our evolving understanding of how technology accentuates student learning. Rapid changes in the technology itself also hamper research. Finally, the intertwining of complex variables in such a rich environment as a school precludes the pure isolation necessary to determine cause and effect.

The Information age with its technological developments has strongly affected education and teaching learning has become an ongoing process. With the development of communication technologies and the changing of learning and teaching paradigms, teaching-learning processes have also entered a new era. New learning environments have been developed. All these offer educators to give up their perception of traditional teaching learning environment. Teacher openness to change influences teachers' willingness to integrate technology into the classroom[8].The attitudes of teachers are important factors influencing use of education technology in classes. Computers are among the most important and most effective technological aids in

language teaching-learning process. Some researches show that teachers do not have positive attitudes toward computers and moreover they have fear against computer use in the classroom[9,10]. In some previous studies[11-14] it was determined that the teachers do not use computers sufficiently and effectively in their classes. In a study by Baylor and Ritchie[8] found a strong positive relationship between teachers who had a higher degree of openness to change and the impact of technology on students' higher-order thinking skills. They argue that this relationship may be because teachers who are innovative and adaptive are better able to implement new teaching strategies that nurture these skills. They stress that technology integration was predicted by two variables: teacher openness to change and the percentage of technology activities with others. The educators should reach a better consensus as to the role technology should play. When technology is introduced to students many respond positively and master the necessary skills quickly. However, for other students it can represent an unpleasant and anxious experience leading to difficulties in mastering appropriate skills[15].

The motivation level of the students and teachers affect use of technology as well. Many educators accept motivation level of the students as the most important factor in successful instruction. Teachers agree that little motivation or interest in the topic makes learning almost impossible[16]. Motivation is said to be a key factor in successful learning. A less able student who is highly motivated can achieve greater success than the more intelligent student who is not well motivated.

Students may come to schools highly motivated and the duty here is to maintain this motivation (Reece & Walker, 1998: 97). But planning learning activities has an important place besides a good level of motivation. The teachers should plan learning activities in order to reach a greater proficiency in learning English. He will lead the students to better conditions in language learning. As learning a foreign language is a complex task, it should not be left to chance. If the teacher goes into classroom without adequate preparation, he will fail[17].

Confidence is developed parallel to motivation. Davies[18] claims that there is a well-established link between achievement and self-confidence in creative teaching and learning which good teachers both recognize and attempt to promote. In their researches, Kimbell *et al.*,[19] and Fryer[20] found that confidence is an important contributor to success in design and technology. Building confidence is crucial to the development of creativity. 'If you tell people they are creative, they are more likely to be creative'.

Use of a variety of education technology both enriches and strengthens learning environment in a way that the students will learn a foreign language effectively. Computers are among the most poplar instructional technology in a classroom setting. Several researchers[21-23] proved that computers have an influential effect on the teaching and learning processes. They state that schools turn into a more student-centered with the use of computers in the classroom, and that more individualized learning takes place than ever before. Student-centered classrooms of today give the teachers new roles and duties quite different than their traditional roles. The students have new roles and perform new functions. Jaber[24] argues that, with the aid of the computer, students are able to collaborate, to use critical thinking, and to find alternatives to solutions of problems in the student-centered classrooms. But the shift from teacher-centered model to a student-centered teaching-learning environment causes to a resistance in change as this type of teaching requires a change in the teacher's method of teaching and learning. Student-centered teaching forces teachers to rethink and reevaluate their teaching methods and student learning methods. Ehrmann[4] states the role of the technology in teaching-learning environments as follows; Technology can enable important changes in curriculum, even when it has no curricular content itself. What matters most are educational strategies for using technology, strategies that can influence the student's total course of study? If such strategies emerge from independent choices made by faculty members and students, the cumulative effect can be significant and yet still remain invisible.

BARRIERS TO TEACHERS USE OF EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY

Barriers to using technology in education includes lack of teacher time, limited access and high costs of equipment, lack or vision or rationale for technology use, lack of teacher training and support, and current assessment practices that may not reflect what is learned with technology[11]. The need for teacher training and the lack of expertise are major barriers to using the microcomputer and related equipment. With computer competence, teachers' anxiety decreases and their attitudes toward computers improves with hands-on computer literacy courses[14]

Petropoulos[25] searched the effectiveness of technology in schools. She stresses the importance of integrating technology with education by following stages; Having all needs for preparation, coordinating classroom activities with new technology, learning how to use technology, reaching success and doing plan for future. To be able to use educational technology effectively, teachers should have practice, so to develop their skills in using technology effectively; they should be given enough time. Lack of time for technology integration in a classroom setting is thought as barrier. Muir-Herzig[14] explains the importance of time and stresses that time gives teachers a chance to experiment with new technologies. Lack of time for technology integration in a classroom setting is thought as a barrier. Time gives teachers a chance to experiment with new technologies.

WHY EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY AT SCHOOLS?

Not only language learners but also language teachers change over time[26]. Change occurs in every area. Rapid changes in technology have affected teaching-learning process deeply. The aim of improving educational quality invites the question of to extent to which new technology aids this process. It is known that traditional formats are not always successful and efficient[27]. New technologies offer opportunities for taking account of individual aptitude and interest. Recent studies in the area indicate that effective use of education technology can help education system work better and more effectively[28]. In a survey administered by Halderman[29] a majority of teachers demand using technology better. Use of technology in the classes gives students the chance of learning faster and more permanent. In another survey administered by Tsou, Wang, and Li[30], a significant increase was statistically found in the test scores of students in a computer aided

learning environment. This proves the positive effect of technology for realizing effective learning.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The aim of this study is to determine the attitudes and opinions of English teachers, who have been working at Elementary schools, towards using education technology in their classes. The sample of the study consists of 150 English teachers working at 63 Elementary schools in Elazýg city center, Turkey. There are totally 150 English teachers teaching English in these schools at the time of this study. The study was conducted in 2002-2003 academic year. Generally, there are two groups of English teachers employed at schools in Turkish education system. This reflects the student selection system for higher education institutions in Turkey. In Turkey, the students are selected to higher education institutions centrally through a nationwide Contested and Placement Center (OSYM) every year in June. Teachers who work as English teachers in Turkish schools at all levels, consisting of elementary education, high school education, higher education, have to finish at least a four-year (bachelor's degree) diploma and they are employed by both the Ministry of National Education and private schools. The first group consists of 47 teachers who have graduated from ELT departments of Turkish universities. The other group consists of 103 teachers who have graduated from other subject areas. Majority of the subjects were those who have not graduated from ELT departments. The sample covers only English teachers working at Elementary schools. The scale was handed all the teachers in the sample in their schools and was collected in the same way. From the outset, the teachers were informed of the purpose of the study and explained that their participation in the research would have an important effect to determine the level of the use of education technology in English classes. They were also told that they would help a lot to determine the current situation mentioned above and to find out solutions for the problems they have been facing by answering honestly and correctly about what they really feel for the Likert-type items and questionnaire of the study.

Data collection tool and data analysis: In order to assess teachers' attitudes and portray their views towards use of education technology in English classes, the present study used the questionnaire procedure as the instrument to collect data. The questionnaire used in the study consisted of two main parts. The first part included questions to obtain information about the demographic characteristics (i.e. number, school type the subjects graduated) of the participants. It also included questions asking the participants about their views on the frequency of use of education technology and activities in English classes. In this part, the participants were wanted to answer the questions by choosing one of the given five alternatives, never, rarely, sometimes, often and always.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of an attitude scale that was used as the main tool of the study. A 36 item, 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree, through agree, partly agree, and disagree to strongly disagree was constructed by the researcher. The scale asked the teachers to describe their attitudes and views towards use of education technology and how much experience they had of using education technology. The design of the items had been piloted on another teacher group who were representing the sample of the study. After factor analysis, KMO (Kayser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy) was found as 0.70. Cronbach Alpha reliability value of the scale was found as .85. Bartlett's test of sphericity was found as 1612,172. A statistically significant difference was found at the level of $p < 0.05$. The scale focused on the difficulty, usefulness, effort, support, interest, effectiveness and acceptance towards education technology. It included items about different aspects of use of education technology, including previous experience and future intentions of the subjects. The data were analyzed by running the program of the Statistical Package for The Social Sciences (SPPS) which enables the researcher to see the statistically significant differences between the given two groups. There are totally 25 positive, 11 negative items in the scale. Positively worded items were scored as follows; completely agree 5, agree 4, partly agree 3, disagree 2, completely disagree 1. Negatively worded items were reversed in order to maintain a homogenous score. To analyze the data obtained from the participants surveyed in the study, following statistical procedures were used; frequency, percentage, mean score, standard deviation, Cronbach Alpha reliability analysis, factor analysis and independent groups t test.

RESULTS

The results reported in this section are mainly based on the data obtained from the questionnaire and Likert-style items. Before giving the results obtained from the questionnaire and attitude scale, the information about the results of reliability analysis of the scale and its sub-scales is given here. Table 1 presents the name of the subscales, and Cronbach alpha reliability scores of each subscale.

Table 1: Cronbach alpha reliability scores for each subscale

Subscales	Item No	Reliability Score
Difficulty	$1* - 7* - 17 - 21* - 31*$	.79
Usefulness	$2 - 6 - 10 - 18 - 23* - 30*$	.73
Effort	$4 - 8 - 11 - 34* - 36$	.71
Support	$3* - 9 - 22 - 26 - 28 - 32$	.79
Interest	$5 - 13* - 15* - 20 - 24 - 29$	.81
Effectiveness	$16* - 19 - 25 - 27$	.75
Acceptance	$12 - 14 - 33 - 35*$	.70

*Negatively worded items

Table 2: Teachers' views on the use of technology in English classes (n: 150)

Technology used	Never f	Never %	Rarely f	Rarely %	Sometimes f	Sometimes %	Often f	Often %	Always f	Always %
Overhead Projector	65	43.4	36	24	17	11.3	26	17.3	6	4
Tape-Recorder	37	24.7	23	15.3	43	28.7	39	26	8	5.3
TV-Video	66	44	44	29.3	13	8.7	21	14	6	4
Slides	25	16.7	47	31.3	35	23.3	27	18	16	10.7
Flashcards	17	11.3	18	12	33	22	69	46	13	8.7
Pictures	9	6	7	4.7	13	8.7	83	55.3	38	25.3
Computer	136	90.7	9	6	5	3.3	-	-	-	-
Board	-	-	-	-	-	-	29	19.3	121	80.7

Table 3: Teachers' views on the use of activities in English classes (n: 150)

Technology used	Never f	Never %	Rarely f	Rarely %	Sometimes f	Sometimes %	Often f	Often %	Always f	Always %
Pair work	17	11.3	26	17.3	32	21.3	65	43.4	10	6.7
Games	23	15.3	28	18.7	43	28.7	39	26	17	11.3
Problem Solving	93	62	30	20	27	18	-	-	-	-
Role-playing	23	15.3	27	18	29	19.3	55	36.7	16	10.7
Group work	16	10.7	36	24	34	22.6	48	32	16	10.7
Authentic Texts	36	24	38	25.3	47	31.4	21	14	8	5.3
Information gap	9	6	17	11.3	23	15.3	85	56.7	16	10.7
Simulation	57	38	33	22	35	23.3	18	12	7	4.7
Drama	47	31.3	38	25.3	22	24.7	27	18	16	10.7

The scale consists of seven subscales. They are difficulty, usefulness, effort, support, interest, effectiveness and acceptance subscales respectively. Cronbach alpha reliability score of each subscale was obtained as .79, .73, .71, .79, .81, .75, .70 respectively.

Views on the use of education technology: The results shown in Table 2 indicate that teachers mostly use board during their teaching. The other technological aids are not used sufficiently by most of the teachers. The results indicate that majority of the teachers show that the teachers do not use computer in their classes. The findings about the techniques the teachers use in their classes are presented in Table 3.

The results showing use of frequency of teaching activities indicate that the teachers mostly use pair work, role-playing and information gap activities. Other teaching activities are not used by the most of the teachers at desired level. The teachers who have graduated from ELT departments are mentioned here as Group 1, the others who have graduated from other subject areas called as Group 2 in the study.

Difficulty in obtaining and using education technology: One of the most important ways of teaching effectively is the difficulty the teachers face in their classes. In this section, the participants were asked whether they had any difficulties during their teaching..

The t test results showing statistical significance between the teachers' views are presented in Table 4. The teachers in Group 1 scored significantly higher on attitudes towards difficulty scale than those in Group 2. From the data analysis, it appears that the teachers in Group 1 are significantly more positive than those in Group 2 in their evaluation on the difficulty of education technology.

Usefulness of education technology: The t test results showing the statistical significance between the views of the teachers in the groups on the usefulness of education technology are presented in Table 5.

Table 4: Independent groups t test results of the groups for difficulty subscale

Subscale	Groups	n	$\overline{X}$	SD	df	t	P
	Group 1	47	103	2.68			
Difficulty	Group 2	2.04	0.4821	0.4493	148	7.981	0.000
Total		150					

Table 5: Independent groups t test results of the Groups for usefulness subscale

Subscale	Groups	n	x	SD	df	t	P
Usefulness	Group 1	47	103	4.28	148	5.227	0.000
	Group 2		3.83	0.395	0.525		
Total		150					

Table 6: Independent Groups t test results of the Groups for effort subscale

Subscale	Groups	n	x	SD	df	t	P
Effort	Group 1	47	3.52	0.518	148	4.494	0.000
	Group 2	103	3.06	0.614			
Total		150					

Table 7: Independent Groups t test results for the support subscale

Subscale	Groups	n	x	SD	df	t	P
Support	Group 1	47	2.78	0.336	148	1.667	0.098
	Group 2	103	2.69	0.276			
Total		150					

Table 8: Independent Groups t test results for the interest subscale

Subscale	Groups	n	x	SD	df	t	P
Interest	Group 1	47	3.40	0.4780	148	6.375	0.000
	Group 2	103	2.91	0.4155			

The t test analysis indicates that the teachers in Group 1 find education technology more useful than those in Group 2. The statistically significant difference found between the views of the groups implies that the teachers graduated from ELT departments feel more positively towards the use of education technology in their classes.

Effort for the use of education technology: Independent groups t test result presented in Table 6 indicates significant differences between the two groups of the participants' evaluating of their efforts in obtaining and using education technology in their classes. The observed difference is in favor of the teachers graduated from ELT departments. The results in effort subscale show that the participants in Group 1 have more effort ($\overline{X}$=3.52) than the teachers in Group 2 ($\overline{X}$=3.06).

Effort for the use of education technology: Independent groups t test result in Table 7 indicate no significant differences between teachers' evaluations of their support they are given during their teaching. It can be said that the t test result in Table 10 indicates that all the teachers in this study do not view attitudes toward support subscale as being positive. When asked whether they are given enough support, they stress that they partly agree with that idea. This means they are not given enough support and the teachers in both groups have the same idea.

Interest towards the use of education technology: The t test results of interest subscale in Table 8 indicate that the teachers graduated from ELT departments have more

Table 9: Independent Groups t Test results for the effectiveness subscale

Subscale	Groups	n	x	SD	df	t	P
Effectiveness	Group 1	47	4.67	0.3218	148	2.122	0.036
	Group 2	103	4.50	0.5216			

Table 10: Independent Groups t test results for the acceptance subscale

Subscale	Groups	n	x	SD	df	t	P
Acceptance	Group 1	47	4.49	0.441	148	1.708	0.090
	Group 2	103	4.33	0.563			

interest ($\overline{X}$= 3.40) than those graduated from other subject areas ($\overline{X}$= 2.91). These results imply that the teachers graduated from ELT departments in this study tend to believe the importance of use of education technology.

Effectiveness of education technology: The t test analysis of the effectiveness subscale of the participants reveals statistically significant difference between the groups. The teachers graduated from ELT departments of the universities in Group 1 scored significantly higher on attitudes towards effectiveness scale than those in Group 2 (P= 0.036) From the analysis of the study data, it appears that the teachers in Group 1 are significantly more positive than those in Group 2 in their evaluation on the effectiveness of education technology (Table 9).

Acceptance towards the importance and use of education technology: The t test results indication no significant differences in Table 10 show that the teachers in both groups commonly accept and completely agree the importance and role of the education technology. Arithmetic mean scores and In the process of teaching English, the teachers in both groups tended strongly agree with the statements, 'students participate actively when I use technological aids', 'In my opinion, education technology enriches learning environment', 'there is a relation between success and use of technology' and 'using education technology makes learning more interesting', the teachers believe and accept the usefulness of education technology. This suggests that the teachers are agreeing on of the advantages of education technology. But while the teachers in Group 1 don't agree ($\overline{X}$= 3.85), the teachers in Group 2 partly agree ($\overline{X}$= 2.92) with the statement 'technology makes learning boring for students'. In responding to the statement, using education technology is a waste of time', the teachers in Group 1 tend to don't agree while the teachers in Group 2 agree. This means that the teachers graduated from ELT departments in the study tend to believe more the usefulness of education technology than the teachers graduated form other subject areas.

Table 11 allows us to see participants' views on the difficulty of education technology. The teachers in Group 1 don't agree while the teachers in Group 2 agree with the

Table 11: Arithmetic Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Teachers' Views

Items	Group1 (n: 47)		Group2 (n: 103)	
	X	SD	x	SD
It is difficult to learn how to use a new technology in the classroom.	4.17	1.049	2.56	1.281
It is not easy to use education technology.	3.98	1.406	2.92	1.576
I can easily get necessary equipment whenever I need.	1.85	0.625	1.60	0.662
School's budget is inadequate for buying necessary materials.	1.38	0.491	1.37	0.485
A person has to do a difficult training course to understand how to use technology in class.	2.02	1.132	1.72	1.033
Students participate actively when I use technological aids.	4.74	0.441	4.67	0.584
In my opinion, education technology enriches learning environment.	4.68	0.629	4.66	0.587
There is a relation between success and use of technology.	4.30	0.883	4.20	0.943
Using education technology makes learning more interesting.	4.62	0.491	4.50	0.778
Technology makes learning boring for students.	3.85	1.560	2.92	1.813
Using education technology is a waste of time.	3.49	1.768	2.03	1.317
I try to bring technological aids into the classroom.	3.55	0.802	3.22	1.212
I always try to persuade my colleagues to use new technologies in the classroom.	3.00	1.123	2.69	1.048
I am very willing to provide technological aids.	2.91	0.686	2.61	1.285
A student can learn a language easily without education technology.	4.70	0.720	3.53	1.809
I always try to discover new ways to create an effective teaching-learning environment.	3.44	1.265	3.24	1.216
My school does not support me when I demand new equipment.	1.83	1.028	1.74	0.960
I share my experiences with my colleagues.	4.49	0.719	4.46	0.751
Teachers of other subject areas at my school support me to provide necessary equipment.	4.57	0.683	4.45	0.849
In-service activities have helped me and developed my skills in using education technology.	2.21	1.062	2.15	1.014
Education technology is easily available at my school.	1.89	0.814	1.74	0.883
I can get enough support easily in finding necessary equipment	1.68	0.810	1.63	0.852
I would like to learn more about new developments in education technology	3.70	1.159	3.40	1.231
I am not interested in using education technology in the classroom.	2.72	1.873	2.15	1.324
I don't have enough knowledge for using technological aids.	3.02	1.406	1.51	0.765
Using education technology in teaching English would be interesting.	4.57	0.651	4.20	1.017
Students pay more attention when I use technology in the classroom.	4.77	0.428	4.76	0.494
I follow new developments in education technology properly.	1.62	1.171	1.47	0.906
I think using technology in class has little effect on students' learning.	4.87	0.494	4.63	0.792
My students learn better when I use technology in the classroom.	4.47	0.718	4.39	0.952
Using education technology has an important place in learning English.	4.70	0.587	4.53	0.669
Technology has a large influence on students' motivation.	4.64	0.568	4.28	0.914
I accept the importance of education technology in teaching English.	4.32	0.810	4.14	1.020
My students accept the importance of technology in language classes.	4.66	0.731	4.55	0.764
My colleagues share my opinions on the use of education technology.	4.43	0.853	4.34	1.025
My students find use of technology interesting	4.51	0.857	4.24	1.339

statements it is difficult to learn how to use a new technology in the classroom, and it is not easy to use education technology. In their respond to the statement I can easily get necessary equipment whenever I need and school's budget is inadequate for buying necessary materials the teachers in both groups tend to completely agree. This result implies that the teachers face difficulties in providing technological aids. The teachers in Group 1 tended to agree more with the statement that I try to bring technological aids into the classroom ($\overline{X}$=3.55) when compared with the teachers in Group 2 ($\overline{X}$=3.22). When asked whether they tried to persuade their colleagues to use new technologies the teachers in Group 1 tended to agree more with that idea (($\overline{X}$=3.00) than the teachers in Group 2 ($\overline{X}$=2.69). In terms of their desire to provide technological aids (I am very willing to provide technological aids), the teachers in Group 1 were found more willing (($\overline{X}$=2.91) than the other group (($\overline{X}$=2.61). In responding to the statement I always try to discover new ways to create an effective teaching-learning

environment, the participants in Group 1 tended to agree ($\overline{X}$=3.44) while the participants in Group 2 tended to partly agree ($\overline{X}$=3.24). From the analysis of the data given in Table 11, it appears that the teachers graduated from ELT departments are significantly more positive than the teachers graduated from other subject areas in their evaluation of their efforts to use technological aids.

As can be seen in Table 11 English teachers evaluate the support they expect from their schools and colleagues. Participants' responses to the statement 'My school does not support me when I demand new equipment' indicate that the schools they work do not support them at sufficient level (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=1.83, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=1.74). When asked whether they share their experiences with their colleagues, it is seen that the teachers in both groups tend to completely agree with that idea (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=4.49, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=4.46). Both teachers in Group 1 and in Group 2 tended to completely agree with the idea 'teachers of other subject areas at my school support me to provide necessary equipment'

(Group 1: $\overline{X}$=4.57, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=4.45). This result implies that the teachers try to give support to each other from the point of providing education technology. In their responses to the statements, 'In-service activities have helped me and developed my skills in using education technology', 'education technology is easily available at my school' and 'I can get enough support easily in finding necessary equipment' the teachers in both groups share the same opinions. By investigating the results of theses statements, it can be argued that in-service activities are not so effective as they are expected, the teachers cannot provide technological aids easily at their schools and they are not supported to provide education technology.

The teachers in Group 1 tended to agree more with the statement that 'I would like to learn more about new developments in education technology' ($\overline{X}$= 3.70), when compared with the teachers in Group 2 ($\overline{X}$= 3.40). When they are asked whether they are interested in using education technology in the classroom, the teachers in Group 1 seem to have a bit more interest ($\overline{X}$= 2.72) than those in Group 2 ($\overline{X}$= 2.15). When they respond to the statement 'I don't have enough knowledge for using technological aids', it is seen that the teachers in Group 1 tend to partly agree ($\overline{X}$= 3.02) while the teachers in Group 2 tend to completely agree ($\overline{X}$= 1.51). In responding to the statements 'using education technology in teaching English would be interesting' and 'students pay more attention when I use technology in the classroom' the participants in both groups tend to completely agree. These results imply the importance of education technology in teaching-learning process. In terms of following new developments in education technology properly, the teachers in both groups do not show positive attitudes (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=1.62, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=1.47).

The teachers in both groups tended to completely agree more with the statements that I think using technology in class has little effect on students' learning' (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=4.87, Group 2: $\overline{X}$= 4.63), 'My students learn better when I use technology in the classroom' (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=4.47, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=4.39), 'Using education technology has an important place in learning English' (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=4.70, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=4.53) and 'Technology has a large influence on students' motivation' (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=4.64, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=4.28). The teachers in Group 1 tended to completely agree ($\overline{X}$= 4.32) while the teachers in Group 2 agree ($\overline{X}$=4.14) with the statement that 'I accept the importance of education technology in teaching English'. Results also show that the teachers think that their students accept the importance of use of education

technology (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=4.66, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=4.55). These findings imply that both groups accept the importance of education technology. It can also be drawn that the teachers try to share their opinions on the use of education technology (Group 1: $\overline{X}$=4.43, Group 2: $\overline{X}$=4.34). Both groups completely agree in their respond to the statement that, 'my students find use of technology interesting'.

DISCUSSION

Results for the use of education technology in English classes tend to point to its importance. The importance of this study is to emphasis that technology has an impact on teaching English and provides effective learning. With this current study it was determined that teachers graduated from ELT departments feel more positive towards use of education technology than those who graduated from other subject areas. Findings for the use of education technology in English classes in the study offer support for the idea that education technology has an important place in teaching English. The generalizability of the results is limited to the typical group that the sample represents. Despite limited generalizability, following implications are derived from the Results of the present study. Using a limited numbers of English language teachers as a case, this study investigated the attitudes and opinions of 150 teachers working at elementary schools in Elazig city center of Turkey.

The results of the present study imply that the teachers think that there is a relation between success and technology use. This is consistent with Halderman's[29] views. In harmony with the findings of surveys by Hardy[9] and Popryzcki and Vidakovic [10], the results of this current study indicated that teachers do not have positive attitudes toward computers.

Some major results have emerged from this research. First, an analysis of the physical equipment, necessary for effective language teaching, at elementary schools where the teacher participants work provided information about the insufficiency of technological aids at schools. The data of the study offer that the teachers use blackboard mostly (80.7). It also appears from the study data that the majority of teachers use pair work, role-playing and information-gap activities as teaching techniques at their classes. The possible reasons for this situation are clear; they do not have technological aids at desired level. With this study it was determined that the teachers do not use computers sufficiently in their classes. This result is consistent with the results of other several studies conducted by US Congress OTA,[11], Sandholtz et al. [12], Wenglinsky[13] and Muir-Herzig,[14].

From the analysis of the study data, it was found that the teachers in Group 1 are significantly more positive than those in Group 2 in their evaluation on the difficulty of education technology. This shows that teacher candidates in ELT departments are trained at better conditions. Another significant difference was observed in usefulness subscale. The teachers graduated from ELT departments agree more on the useful sides of education technology than the other teachers. The teachers in both groups stress that education technology has an important place in teaching learning process but they are not so willing in using education technology in their classes. The teachers' schools do not have necessary equipment and they do not get enough support from their schools. The teachers mostly use board. Pair work, role playing and information gap activities are most used techniques in the classroom.

Teachers are expected to use education technology in their classes so that they can enrich learning environment. The findings obtained from this study indicate that teachers do not use it effectively although they are open to use it. In the search for effective use of education technology, scientific researchers must continue to investigate the effect of education technology in order to derive a more scientific basis for technology use, and examine, describe, and compare curricular activities that utilize the education technology, and their variously defined effects. In general, the results indicate the importance of the use of education technology use, statistically significant differences were observed between the two groups. The teachers in-group one appear to be at a better position in their views on the difficulty of technology use. These results are in line with the study findings that examined views on the difficulty of technology use in the field.

CONCLUSIONS

Within the limits of this present study, it can be said that the attitudes and opinions of English teachers towards the use of education technology are not the same and statistically significant differences have been found between teachers' attitudes and opinions on the use of education technology in their language classes.

SUGGESTIONS

In the light of the findings of this current study following suggestions are recommended: Education technology must be introduced to the teachers working in elementary schools, schools should be equipped with necessary technological aids, teachers should have in-service courses about the use of education technology and new technological aids should be introduced to the teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Kulik, J.A., R.L. Bangert and G.W. Williams, 1983. Effects of computer-based teaching on secondary school students. J. Educational Psychol., 75: 19–26.
2. Kulik J.A. and C.C. Kulik, 1989. Effectiveness of computer-based instruction. School Library Media Quarterly 17: 19–21.
3. Scott, T., M. Cole and M. Engel, 1992. Computers and education: A cultural constructivist perspective. Review of Research in Education 18: 191–251.
4. Ehrmann, S.C., 1995. Asking the right questions. Change, March. (From Academic Abstracts).
5. Durndell, A. and A. Thomson, 1997. Gender and computing: A decade of change?. Computers and Education, 28: 1–10.
6. Hakkarainen, K., L. Ilomäki, L. Lipponen, H. Muukkonen, M. Rahikainen, T. Tuominen, M. Lakkala and E. Lehtinen, 2000. Students' skills and practices of using ICT: Results of a national assessment in Finland. Computers and Education 34 :103–117.
7. Jipping, M., S. Dieter, J. Krikke and S. Sandro, 2001. Using handheld computers in the classroom: laboratories and collaboration on handheld machines. In Proceedings of the 2001 SIGCSE Technical Symposium, SIGCSE Technical Bulletin. Charlotte, North Carolina, United States, pp: 169–173.
8. Baylor, A.L. and D. Ritchie, 2002. What factors facilitate teacher skill, teacher morale, and perceived student learning in technology-using classrooms?. Computers and Education, 39: 395-414.
9. Hardy, J.V., 1998. Teacher attitudes toward and knowledge of computer technology. Computers in the Schools 14: 119-136.
10. Paprzycki, M. and D. Vidakovic, 1994. Prospective Teachers' Attitudes Toward Computers. In. J. Willis, B. Robin and D.A. Willis (Eds.), Technology and Teacher Education Annual 1994 Charlottesville, VA: AACE. pp: 74-76.
11. US Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, Teachers and technology: making the connection (Report No. OTA-EHR-616), US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC (1995).
12. Sandholtz, J., C. Ringstaff and D. Dwyer, 1997. Teaching with technology: Creating Studentcentered Classrooms. New York: Teachers College Pres.

13. Wenglinsky, H., 1998. Does it computer: the relationship between educational technology and student achievement in mathematics. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ (1998) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 425 191).

14. Muir-Herzig, R.G., 2004. Technology and its impact in the classroom. Computers and Education, 39: 111-131.

15. Loyd, B.H. and C. Gressard, 1984. Reliability and factorial validity of computer attitude scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 44 : 501-505.

16. Dick, W., L. Carey and J.O. Carey, 2001. The Systematic Design of Instruction. 5th (Edn.). United States: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc

17. Silvers, S.M., 1982. Games For The classroom and the English speaking club. English teaching forum, 20 : 29-33.

18. Davies, T., 2000. Confidence Its role in the creative teaching and learning of design and technology. Journal of Technology Education, (Fall 2000), 12 (1)

19. Kimbell, R.A., K. Stables, T. Wheeler, A. Wosniak and V. Kelly, 1991. The Assessment of Performance in Design and Technology.: Schools Examinations and Assessments Council (SEAC).London, UK.

20. Fryer, M., 1996. Creative Teaching and Learning. Paul Chapman Publishing. London, UK:

21. Bork, A., 1985. Personal computers for education. New York: Harper and Row

22. Papert, S., 1980. Mindstorms: Children, Computers, and Powerful ideas. New York: Basic Boks.

23. Ragosta, M., 1983. Computer-assisted instruction and compensatory education: a longitudinal analysis. Machine-Mediated Learning, 1: 97–127.

24. Jaber, W., 1997. A survey of factors which influence teachers' use of computer-based technology. Dissertation Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

25. Petropoulos, H., 2001. Are we there yet? How to know when you have enough technology in a school', ERIC No: EJ 637658.

26. Verity, D.P., 2000. Side Affects: The Strategic Development of Professional Satisfaction, In Socio-Cultural Theory and Second Language Learning. Ed. James P. Lantof. Hong Kong : Oxford University Press.pp: 179- 197.

27. Milleken, J., L.P.Barnes, 2002. Teaching and technology in higher education: student perceptions and personal reflections. Computers and Education, 39: 223-235.

28. Jonassen, D. and T. Reeves, 1996. Learning with Technology: Using Computers as Cognitive Tools. In Jonassen, D.H. (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational communications and technology New York: Macmillan. pp: 693-719.

29. Halderman, C.F., 1992. Design and evaluation of staff development program for technology in schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53: 4186.

30. Tsou, W., W. Wang and H. Li, 2002. How computers facilitate English foreign language learners acquire English abstract words, Computers and Education, 39: 415-428.